

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

BINGHUI LIU,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:25-cr-00089-KES-BAM

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR BAIL
REVIEW

(ECF Nos. 16, 18)

On June 2, 2025, Defendant Binghui Liu filed a motion for bail review based upon changed circumstances that (1) Defendant can proffer a real property secured bond in an amount in excess of \$80,000.00 or full equity bond in property located in Hayward, California, which Defendant proffered at the June 9, 2025 hearing was expected to amount to approximately \$135,000.00; and (2) Defendant has identified a potential third party custodian. (ECF No. 16.) On June 4, 2025, the Government filed its opposition. (ECF No. 18.) On June 9, 2025, the Court held a hearing on the matter. Defendant appeared in custody, aided by an interpreter, with counsel Nicholas Reyes. Counsel Cody Chapple and Arelis Clemente appeared on behalf of the Government. Having considered the moving and opposition papers, as well as the arguments presented at the June 9, 2025 hearing, the Court shall deny Defendant's motion for bail review.

A bail hearing "may be reopened, before or after a determination by the judicial officer, at any time before trial if the judicial officer finds that information exists that was not known to the movant at the time of the hearing and that has a material bearing on the issue whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure the appearance of such person as required

1 and the safety of any other person and the community.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f).

2 For the reasons stated on the record, Defendant’s new information¹ does not change the
3 previous finding that there is no condition or combination of conditions which will reasonably
4 assure the appearance of the Defendant and the safety of the community. Therefore, Defendant’s
5 motion for bail review (ECF No. 16) is DENIED. The Defendant shall remain detained.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: June 10, 2025



STANLEY A. BOONE
United States Magistrate Judge

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 ¹ As the Court expressed at the hearing held in this matter, the Court liberally assumes, without deciding, that
28 Defendant presented new information based upon Defendant’s proffer of a higher equity amounting to
approximately \$135,000 and the previously proffered third-party custodian who at that hearing only offered a
\$20,000 cash bond, despite her residence being available.